

This is a problem that will only be resolved with more thoughtfulness and more direct candor about the nature of the problem and working closely with our allies, both Arabs and others.

We should also focus a little bit more on terrorism generally rather than get diverted, as we seem to be, in specific countries. It is extremely complex, but there is building concern in the United States about United States policy in Iraq. I join those who believe we should focus more on terrorism around the world. This requires the cooperation of a lot more countries around the world to be successful. I hope we can accomplish that.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2330, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2330) to sanction the ruling Burmese military junta, to strengthen Burma's democratic forces and support and recognize the National League of Democracy as the legitimate representative of the Burmese people, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). There is 1 hour of debate equally divided in the usual form with no amendments to the bill.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Burma sanctions bill. This bill is the result of a collaborative effort between Senators MCCONNELL, GRASSLEY and myself.

When first introduced, the bill would have imposed sanctions without an opportunity for congressional review. I was concerned that Congress would simply pass a bill, and then forget about Burma.

I think that is the wrong approach when it comes to sanctions.

Senator GRASSLEY and I worked hard to ensure that Congress would have the opportunity to revisit this issue every year. The House went even further, by requiring an annual vote, plus a 3-year sunset.

Now, make no mistake about it, the actions by the dictatorship in Burma are unacceptable. The arrests and treatment of Aung San Suu Kyi are deplorable and cannot be tolerated.

Yet as is so often the case when we debate the merits of international sanctions, the question is not whether to punish Burma's ruling regime; the question is how to do so effectively.

We have learned through our own experiences that unilateral sanctions simply don't work. They rarely desta-

bilize the oppressive regime that is the target of the sanctions. Instead, they only hurt the people—both in the target country and even here in the United States.

Unfortunately, we have also seen how, once a sanctions policy is in place, it is very difficult—no matter how ineffective the policy is, to terminate it and find a better solution.

So, how do we deal with this dilemma?

The answer is found in a simple appeal to common sense.

First, we must actively seek the cooperation of our allies. Multilateral action is essential if the policy is to be effective. Second, we must give ourselves a chance to review and revise the policy if it isn't working.

That is what this bill does with Burma. It imposes sanctions. It also encourages the president to work with our allies in the region to build a collective response. And I understand our allies are considering sanctions.

This bill also requires Congress to revisit the issue every year. If the policy is working, then we can renew it. But if it isn't working, then we can terminate it and try a new policy. This legislation will keep the dictatorship's feet to the fire. It will create regular incentives for them to change.

It is just this sort of common-sense approach that is needed with other U.S. sanctions, particularly against Cuba.

By any honest assessment, our embargo against Cuba—now in its fifth decade—is a total failure. The U.S. is alone in pursuing this failed policy, yet politics prevents us from reassessing it.

Thus, the Cuban embargo has become institutionalized. And the fight to end the embargo, even though ending it makes so much sense, has become a difficult, uphill battle.

We do not want that to happen to the Burma sanctions. We want the people of Burma to enjoy true democracy and freedom. And we want to pursue the policy that will help them achieve this. So we will try sanctions. But if they don't work, and if we are not joined by our allies in this cause, then Congress will revisit this issue in a year.

In the coming weeks, many Members will be pressing for action to reform Cuba sanctions. I hope that today's debate on Burma highlights the inconsistency of our sanctions policy, and that we can apply a common-sense approach as we move forward on other sanctions issues.

I now would like to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

IRAQ INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Montana who as always is representing issues that make an enormous difference to the quality of our debates here on the Senate floor but, more important, to how our world works, both here at home and abroad. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I rise today to join in a growing expression of concern by my colleagues and the American people about the possible misrepresentation of intelligence information by the President and the administration in building its case for the war in Iraq. Without a thorough explanation of why many of the administration's statements are in conflict, and have included claims unsubstantiated by the best intelligence, the American people, their representatives, and many of our would-be international partners in post-conflict Iraq, will most certainly begin to lose confidence in the administration's word. Simply, the Nation's credibility, in my view, is at stake.

That credibility is vital as we approach burden-sharing efforts in the reconstruction and democratization of Iraq, the projected cost of which grows each and every day.

There were reports again this morning that another American soldier lost his life in that reconstruction and democratization effort. All told, in New Jersey there have been seven men and women who have lost their lives in Iraq. We are paying a serious toll, not only in terms of financial expense, as recently reported, but, most importantly, in the life and blood of our brave soldiers.

A thorough public review is necessary, in my view, if we are to reestablish the United States' credibility. And once all the facts come to light, we need to hold those responsible accountable. Our leaders need to promptly admit and correct all misstatements, exaggerations, and overreaching interpretations.

On the White House Web site, the pages that relate to the conflict of Iraq are titled "Denial and Deception." The American people can only hope that is not a moniker for the administration's presentation of its case for the war in Iraq.

As we are now all well aware, in this year's State of the Union Address President Bush said:

The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

The power of the President's allegations in those 16 short words cannot be overstated. The Bush administration, using legalistic language, was leading people to embrace, at least in my view, the view that Saddam Hussein had an active nuclear program. The President didn't say the British were claiming anything. He didn't say they alleged anything. He said they "learned" that Saddam was attempting to buy uranium, implicitly accepting the charge as fact.

Although just 16 words long, it was a powerful statement that resonated in the context of debates that had gone on throughout the Nation and the world. Only much later did we the people and the Congress learn this statement was based on information that our own intelligence agency earlier learned was false.

Yesterday morning, Senator LEVIN, the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, laid out seven questions about claims regarding Iraq and the uranium. Senator LEVIN argued these should be answered in the context of a bipartisan investigation. I believe that is true, and I could not agree more.

This is not just a concern about the African uranium issue. It is about whether there was a fair and full presentation to the American people. But to the list of the seven questions, I would add an eighth. If the information in the State of the Union Address was technically accurate, as administration officials have lately argued, why was it excluded in Secretary Powell's 90-minute presentation before the United Nations only 8 days later? Why was the intelligence on alleged Iraqi uranium purchases good enough for the State of the Union Address, a 1-hour speech addressing a variety of issues besides Iraq, but not good enough for a U.N. speech laying out the complete case against Iraq in painstaking detail 1 week later?

I would add a ninth question to Senator LEVIN's list. Why did we learn about the misleading nature of these comments in the State of the Union, not from the administration, but from the International Atomic Energy Agency and the media? If there is no good explanation for the administration's delay in correcting the error, it is hard to escape the conclusion this was not just a series of blunders. Was it a strategy for winning an argument? What was it about? Was there a coverup involved? I think those questions need to be asked.

This is not an academic matter. At stake is nothing less than the credibility of the United States, and that is important for protecting the American people. That credibility gets weakened each day the administration fails to provide a complete and candid explanation of what happened. Who knew? When did they know it? Why did they wait until now to break the conspiracy of silence?

Keep in mind, political leaders around the world, not just here at home, have staked their own reputations on their support of President Bush and the United States. As a consequence, many of our closest allies and their elected officials are facing enormous criticism from their own citizens, and sometimes—and this is quite telling—from their own political parties. We owe it not only to the American people but to all those who stood with us to be straight and to come clean immediately. Otherwise, this episode will only undermine our ability to win support for other critical foreign policy interests in the future, and they are substantial. In fact, without a clear explanation or an admission of fault, we put the American people at risk facing a world where our partners question our credibility on all issues—Iran and Syria, North Korea.

The problem is especially troubling when viewed in the context of a broader pattern of selective information provided by the administration. Last October, for example, during the Iraqi debate—this is one that is particularly troubling to me—Secretary James Kelly was in Pyongyang, meeting with the North Koreans. At that meeting, a meeting that occurred a full week prior to the Senate vote on the resolution authorizing force in Iraq, the North Koreans admitted to an active nuclear program. Yet despite its importance and relevance to the debate regarding Iraq and America's national security posture generally, the administration waited until after the Congress had voted on the resolution to authorize the use of force before revealing the details of the North Korean disclosure.

To this Senator, that information was both relevant and timely to the Iraqi debate. Apparently, because it might affect the tenor of the debate, the information was withheld from the full Congress until after the vote.

What are our priorities? Where were the dangers and how do we frame this issue, particularly as it relates to the security of the people of the United States? I ask, where is and where was the greater risk to the American people?

As Senator LEVIN and others have explained, there were many other instances in which the administration selectively, in some form or another, misrepresented or withheld information to support their case for the war in Iraq.

For example, the administration claimed there were linkages between al-Qaida and Iraq. But those claims now seem overstated or exaggerated and apparently were based on scant and circumstantial evidence.

Another widely discussed issue relates to Iraq's purchase of aluminum tubes, where there was considerable debate within the intelligence community about whether the tubes were useful as part of a nuclear program.

When you add up these claims, it becomes clear that the administration certainly was seeking to win an argument—not inform—and quite obviously it worked.

As John Adams once said, "Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, or inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence."

We need to ensure that the facts come out. We should do it on a bipartisan basis, and we should do it immediately. The safety and security of the American people are at stake.

We need to hold accountable not only those responsible for providing misleading intelligence but also those responsible for preventing the facts from coming out. The credibility of this President and the future credibility of the United States are at stake. I hope we can deal with this in an expeditious and clear manner. Hopefully, this in turn will set us on a course where we

can share the burdens not only in Iraq but of protecting the American people around the globe in the days and years ahead.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate is going to do something important later this morning; that is, send a message to Burma that we don't intend to do business with them any longer. In addition to that, this Freedom and Democracy Act, which will pass the Senate later this morning and go down to the President for signature, will guarantee that we have another debate in each of the next 3 years very similar to the MFN China issue with which we are all familiar where the issue came back before the Senate with an expedited procedure once a year.

This is not the last time we will be dealing with the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, and certainly it will not be the last time we deal with Burma until the legitimately elected leader of that country is not only out of prison but in power.

I thank my colleagues in both the Senate and House for acting quickly on the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. The 418-2 vote in the House yesterday complements the 97-1 vote we had on a very similar bill in the Senate on June 11.

The message from the United States Congress to the world could not be more clear—the assault on freedom in Burma will not stand.

With the cooperation and support of my colleagues in the Senate, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act will shortly be on its way to the White House for signature by the President.

When the people of Burma needed support in their struggle for freedom, America acted—and acted decisively.

Unfortunately, there has been no change in the situation in Burma since this measure was first introduced.

It is an outrage and a violation of human decency that democracy leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and other democrats continue to be held by the thugs calling themselves the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC). Instead of giving the world access to Suu Kyi, Burmese strongman General Than Shwe has dispatched his minions to regional capitals on a misinformation campaign laying blame for the May 30 ambush on Suu Kyi and her party, the National League for Democracy (NLD). Few should be duped by this desperate measure, and an import ban and other sanctions against Burma cannot come soon enough.

More must be done to support the struggle of freedom in Burma. It is past time that neighbors—especially Thailand and China—take off their blinders to the multitude of dangers posed by Burma to the region. We already know that HIV/AIDS and drug use unravels the social and economic fabric of bordering countries, and engagement with the SPDC serves only to further perpetuate lawlessness in Burma that

threatens peace and stability, not just in Burma but throughout all of south-east Asia.

The United Nations has a role to play in creating a unified front against the regime. The Security Council should be briefed by U.N. Special Envoy Razali Ismail on the situation in Burma, and further action by that body should be contemplated.

However, words of condemnation are not enough. While I was pleased to meet with Razali when he was in Washington last week, frankly, his time is better spent in Asia shuttling between capitals and marshaling support for the release of Suu Kyi and other democrats and for the recognition of the results of the 1990 elections which have never been honored. Suu Kyi and her party got 80 percent of the vote but were never allowed to take power, and she has been under house arrest for most of the last 3 years.

America's leadership is as important as it can possibly be. By signing the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, President Bush will clearly signal that the United States stands by the Burmese people in their hour of need. Our allies should take note of the import ban and other measures contained in the act and immediately follow suit.

The only way this is going to work is on a multilateral basis. It worked in South Africa. Generally, I am skeptical of these kinds of import bans. But there was one conspicuous example of where it worked, and that was in South Africa. The reason it did was because everybody cooperated. We are calling on the international community to isolate these thugs and not do business with them.

Change will come in Burma only if the free world has the collective will to hold the SPDC accountable for its brutality.

Some may continue to beat the ragged drum of engagement, but dialog is as dead as those the SPDC murdered on May 30. It is folly to think engagement will "encourage positive changes" within the SPDC. This tiger will never change its stripes. For over a decade, engagement has been tried. While the junta has made hollow promises of "reconciliation" with the NLD and ethnic nationalities, general Than Shwe has no intentions of relinquishing power on his own. He must be pressured by the world into doing so.

It is not enough for envoys and diplomats to meet with Than Shwe's underlings and other senior SPDC leaders in Rangoon. Than Shwe's grip in Burma is no less than Saddam Hussein's was in Iraq. If Japan, Thailand, Indonesia, and other Southeast Asian nations are to have an impact on the situation, they must deal directly with Burma's top thug.

Let me be clear. Than Shwe is personally responsible for the May 30 murders and subsequent injury and arrest of countless Burmese democracy activists. He is responsible for the ongoing and systemic egregious human rights

abuses perpetuated upon the ethnic nationalities in that country.

The fact that no outsider has seen Suu Kyi since Razali's brief meeting in early June should be a cause for alarm.

We need to know exactly where she is being held and the state of her physical condition. No one has time for peek-a-boo games the junta may be interested in playing.

Suu Kyi must be immediately and unconditionally released, along with all other democrats whose only crime is advocating democracy and the rule of law.

With the passage of this act, our work on this issue is hardly over. The people of Burma can count on America's continued support for the struggle for freedom in their country. I intend to seize every opportunity to advance this cause both in Washington and abroad.

And I know that I can count on many of my colleagues to do the same. I particularly want to thank Senators FEINSTEIN and MCCAIN, who are no less outraged than I at the horrific abuses of the SPDC and the continued detention of Suu Kyi and other Burmese democrats. On the House side, Congressmen LANTOS, KING, and HYDE were equally energetic in responding to this crisis. Burma has no better friends than these freedom-loving Americans.

Democracy and the rule of law will prevail in Burma. As we near this historic vote this morning, I am reminded of the Reverend Martin Luther King's observation that the "arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice." This morning, we must commit ourselves never to tire in the pursuit of justice in long-suffering Burma until Suu Kyi is free and the struggle for freedom won.

Suu Kyi has kindled the flame of freedom in the hearts and minds of her compatriots. America must ensure that it is never extinguished.

Let me close by saying that the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act would not have moved so swiftly through the Congress were it not for the efforts of Senator FEINSTEIN and particularly Senator MCCAIN. Senators LUGAR and BIDEN of the Foreign Relations Committee gave this legislation an opportunity to move quickly. They could have insisted on it going to Foreign Relations. They did not. Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS had very useful suggestions to make in terms of the form of the final bill. And my colleague Senator LEAHY also played an integral part.

Over in the House, Congressmen LANTOS, DELAY, THOMAS, HYDE, and KING were all instrumental in securing swift passage of the act.

In terms of staff, I just want to mention my crew who were involved: Billy Piper, my chief of staff; Brian Lewis, who is my counsel on the Senate floor; Robert Karem; and Paul Grove, a long-time friend and associate, who is the staff director of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, who has had an intense interest in this issue for a long time.

I give special thanks and recognition to my former staffer who used to have Paul Groves' job, Robin Cleveland, who is now Assistant OMB Director in the Bush administration, who, 10 years ago, sparked my interest in this whole issue. It is hard to believe it has been 10 years, but, unfortunately, not much has changed in Burma. Ten years of the status quo is completely unacceptable. The Burmese people have a friend in Robin Cleveland.

Finally, I thank those in the NGO community for their tireless efforts in support of Burma. There are a lot of very committed activists in the United States who also travel to the area who are intensely interested in this issue and who will never give up until Suu Kyi has an opportunity to be free not only of prison but free to assume the power that she and her supporters earned in the free elections back in 1990.

Mr. President, I know Senator MCCAIN wants to speak. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 19 minutes 5 seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I do want to make a few further observations related to Thailand, Burma's neighbor, and their policy toward Burma.

When Thai Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra was in Washington last week, we had an opportunity to discuss the situation in Burma and Thai policy toward the repressive regime. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister seemed to indicate that Thailand would not change its policy of engagement with the SPDC. I know the President brought it up with him as well because the President told me he brought the matter up with the Thais as well when he met the Thai Prime Minister. If we look at Thailand today, we can see the benefits of this policy they have been following.

Drug abuse has spun wildly out of control, causing His Majesty the King of Thailand to publicly comment on the threats to his beloved country from narcotics trafficking and abuse. With this abuse has come HIV/AIDS, crime and prostitution.

Where do these drugs come from? Why, they come from Burma, of course.

Thailand today is home to countless innocent people seeking sanctuary from gross human rights violations and the denial of even the most basic of freedoms. Thailand's response has been

less than compassionate, with many of these men, women, and children detained and deported back to their homeland, and others denied access to humanitarian assistance.

Where do the refugees have to return? Why, Burma, of course.

Tensions along the Thai-Burma border have periodically spilled over into skirmishes between Thai soldiers and those of the SPDC. Burmese investment in armaments, including MiG aircraft purchased from Russia, pose an immediate danger to the entire region.

What is the source of this instability? Burma.

The Thai Prime Minister should have departed the United States with a firm understanding that protection of freedom in Burma was a top priority for both Congress and the administration.

Unfortunately, I do not think he got the message.

I understand that on July 31 and August 1 a meeting will be held in Bangkok between Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Burma to discuss economic cooperation strategies. Prime Minister Shinawatra should take note of the vote we are about to cast and reconsider hosting this meeting.

Instead of promoting economic cooperation strategies, Thailand should be working to free Aung San Suu Kyi and other democrats being detained by the SPDC. Democrats should help democrats during times of duress.

I will have more to say about Thailand at a later date, but we should have a right to expect more from the Thais who have been one of our strongest allies in that region over the years.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, first, I thank Senator MCCONNELL for his leadership on this issue, not only now as we are in an incredibly critical moment in time in the history of the struggle of the Burmese people for freedom, but for his longstanding advocacy in this noble cause and his commitment to the security and safety of one of the heroic figures of the 20th and 21st centuries, Aung San Suu Kyi.

Again, I thank him for not only motivating this body to rapid passage of this legislation but to his work with the other body which has resulted in us being able to pass it overwhelmingly today. I thank Senator MCCONNELL again, and I regret to say we are a long way from seeing a resolution of this terrible unfolding, unending tragedy taking place in Burma. I guess as a personal pique, I refuse to call it

Muanmar, which the junta have changed the name to, and we have a lot more to do. But I believe what we are doing today, because of his sponsorship, will send a message throughout Burma that we have not abandoned this heroic woman, nor have we abandoned the cause of democracy and freedom in this country of gentle people who deserve a great deal better than the group of thugs who have been oppressing them and repressing them for a long period of time.

It has been almost 7 weeks since Burma's military junta orchestrated a savage attack on Burma's democrats and their leader Aung San Suu Kyi. In response Congress acted with extraordinary speed and consensus to send to the President's desk the bill before us banning imports from Burma. It is imperative that he sign it immediately, as I am confident he will.

Aung San Suu Kyi and the Burmese people can't wait, nor should Burma's rulers and neighbors wait a day longer to hear the United States speak with one voice in support of freedom in Burma. Congressional action on this bill is nearing completion, but as the Senator from Kentucky has said, our commitment to Burma's people will not end until they are free. Our resolve will not weaken as long as the junta denies the Burmese people a right to live in a nation ruled by law, not fear, led by the elected leader whose appeal no amount of violence can diminish and whose courage no amount of suffering can dim.

It is now time for Burma's leaders, especially the frontline states, to join the United States and Europe in rejecting half measures and implementing a fundamentally new approach that looks forward to Burma's liberation rather than a mere moderation of an illegitimate regime's rule. Southeast Asia will not be stable or secure as long as the generals rule in Rangoon. Placing hope in a policy of reconciliation that relies more on the junta's goodwill than on international pressure for democratic change will do nothing to alter a status quo that upholds tyranny.

China, India, and Thailand directly suffer the effects of regional insecurity caused by AIDS, drugs, and refugees that flow across Burma's borders. They also suffer the economic consequences of living next to a bankrupt nation whose economy is controlled largely by drug lords and a corrupt military elite. While China may not be troubled by dictatorship in Burma, it would clearly benefit economically from having another Asian tiger on its borders which good government and Burma's natural wealth would make it.

Democratic India would benefit strategically and economically from a fellow democracy in Rangoon that could expand Indian influence in Southeast Asia and serve as a significant trading partner.

We expect more in particular from our ally Thailand which has done little

of substance to support change in Burma since the May 30 attacks. As far as I am concerned, business as usual won't cut it. We frankly expect a democratic ally such as Thailand to do more to oppose dictatorship in Burma, both out of principle and because of the insecurity its misrule brings to Thailand. We will be watching for signs of a new policy approach in Bangkok. This will be an issue in our bilateral relationship.

We welcome Japan's announcement of suspending new assistance to Burma as a result of the junta's crackdown. But Tokyo's existing aid programs send a mixed signal to the democrats who were so heartened by popular protests on their behalf in the streets of Tokyo. We would welcome the Government of Japan's reassessment of its entire policy toward Burma.

All of us appreciated ASEAN's joint statement calling for Aung San Suu Kyi's early release at the Phnom Penh summit, breaking with the group's history of noninterference in each other's affairs. But friends of ASEAN want to see it take concrete steps to prove its relevance to security and stability in Southeast Asia.

I remind my colleagues that when ASEAN admitted Burma into ASEAN, it was with the promise and commitment that things would improve in Burma. No one can argue that there has been anything but retrogression and an increase in brutality and, of course, the latest outrage in the capture and mistreatment of their freely elected leader.

Events in Burma are testing ASEAN as never before. Burma's crisis impacts every nation in the region, from AIDS, drugs, and refugees to political and economic instability. Those of us who want ASEAN to succeed expect it to play a leadership role in its own backyard and to deliver on its promises in 1997 that membership would change Burma. Some of us weren't convinced then and we are not convinced today. Burma will soon be preparing to assume ASEAN's presidency in 2006. What kind of an image does ASEAN have with Burma as its president? ASEAN's credibility can't withstand the presidency of a rogue regime that is unreconstructed and brutal, which has the blood of its people on its hands and imprisons their elected leader. As long as Burma festers, ASEAN looks either incapacitated, weak, or irrelevant.

As long as Aung San Suu Kyi remains in prison and the Burmese people live in fear, convinced Burma's neighbors are complicit in their suffering, the problem of Burma will be an issue in America's bilateral relations with nations across Asia. It is time for Burma to command the attention of the U.N. Security Council. Burma's misrule is clearly of international importance. The council has not even formally been briefed by Ambassador Razali Ismail since his visit over a

month ago to Rangoon as the Secretary General's personal representative. The United States should demand that the Security Council take up this issue.

As the United States, the EU, and even ASEAN have acknowledged, Burma is an international problem. The council would be remiss to ignore it, and even a council debate would command the attention of the generals. It might also command some attention in Beijing, Bangkok, Tokyo, and other capitals with the power to make a difference. It is past time for the United States and our allies to press this issue.

I am proud that Congress, with passage of this legislation, is speaking with one voice in support of Aung San Suu Kyi and the Burmese people. The generals must know we won't let up the pressure until Burma is free. The United States stands with the Burmese people in their struggle for the freedom that is their birthright and which the generals have stolen from them. We will do everything in our power to help them take back their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that four editorials be printed in the RECORD. Two are from the Washington Post, one from the Wall Street Journal, and the final one a comment by Jack Straw, the foreign minister of Great Britain.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 2003]

STOP STALLING ON BURMA

U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan is scheduled to meet with President Bush at the White House today. Ahead of time, U.N. officials said they expected the two men to discuss Liberia, the Middle East and other matters. We trust that among those other matters will be a subject about which both leaders have claimed to be highly concerned: the crackdown on democracy activists in Burma. The leader of that Southeast Asian nation's democracy movement—the rightful leader of the country, in fact—remains in captivity, and neither Mr. Bush nor Mr. Annan has rallied to her defense as strenuously as one would expect.

It's been a month since Secretary of State Colin L. Powell promised prompt action to penalize the generals he referred to as "the thugs who run the Burmese government." The time had come, he said in an op-ed article in the Wall Street Journal, to freeze their financial assets and ban remittances to Burma. But the administration has taken no such steps. It's been six weeks since the junta sent 3,000 vigilantes, armed with wooden bats and sharpened iron rods, to beat and stab Aung San Suu Kyi's supporters as they traveled with her in the hinterland. Aung San Suu Kyi, a Nobel peace laureate, apparently escaped injury but was taken into custody and, except for one brief interview with a U.N. envoy, has not been heard from since. The Senate shortly thereafter approved a measure banning imports from Burma, where the generals control most companies, but the bill has yet to emerge from the House. It's scheduled for action this week; the House should vote and the president should sign the bill quickly into law.

And the United Nations? You might think the Security Council would have swung into

action to demand freedom for one of the world's most courageous leaders and for her colleagues and to address the threat to regional stability posed by the increasingly erratic junta. After all, there is no dispute as to her legitimacy; the party she leads overwhelmingly won an election in 1990 but has never been permitted to take its rightful place in government. So far, however, the chief U.N. response has been the election of Burma—or Myanmar, as the generals call it—to the vice presidency of the General Assembly for the session that begins in September.

For many years now, the United Nations and the United States have supported dialogue between Aung San Suu Kyi and the nation's junta leading toward peaceful democratization. She has consistently endorsed such a nonviolent process, even during many years of house arrest. With their murderous attack of May 30 and subsequent incarceration of her, Burma's leaders have shown contempt for the idea, and so far they have paid little price. The president and the secretary general could begin to change that equation today.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 2003]

WHERE SHE IS

Since Government-sponsored goons attacked Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi and her supporters on a provincial road May 30, the Nobel Peace laureate has been in confinement and virtually cut off from the world. In editorials earlier this month urging that Aung San Suu Kyi be freed we asked, "Where is she?" Now we know—and the answer could hardly be more discouraging. According to the British Foreign Office, the corrupt generals who rule Burma moved her from a "guesthouse," where she had been held ostensibly for her own protection, to the notorious Insein Prison, a colonial-era monstrosity where old dog kennels have been converted to torture cells. The disclosure of the move came on Aung San Suu Kyi's 58th birthday—a nice touch, and well in keeping with the usual mode of operation of Burma's ruling thugs, who a few years back refused to allow Aung San Suu Kyi's husband to visit her even when he was dying of cancer.

Usual methods, yes, but other governments can no longer respond with their usual apathy. Burma is a beautiful, resource-rich nation of 50 million people, strategically located at the crossroads of India, China and Southeast Asia. Its largely Buddhist population, once among the best-educated in Asia, has fallen into poverty after a half-century of military misrule. Thirteen years ago the generals, misreading their subjects as dictators so often do, permitted an election—and Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy won more than four out of five parliamentary seats, even though she was under house arrest at the time. The generals nullified the election and kept the NLD leader under house arrest for most of the succeeding decade. They put hundreds of would-be parliamentarians and other NLD activists in prison. They continued to run the economy into the ground, while Burma's drug trade flourished and the generals enriched themselves corruptly.

Last year, under international pressure, the dictators released Aung San Suu Kyi and promised a dialogue leading toward democracy. But once again her popularity—freedom's popularity—seems to have surprised them. They cracked down more brutally than before, settled back to see whether the world cared—and so far seem to have seen little reaction that might worry them. On June 11 the Senate, led by Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), voted 97 to 1 to cut off imports from

Burma, which would deal a blow to the generals, who control most of the economy. A companion House bill seemed to be making progress late last week. The White House and Secretary of State Colin L. Powell have issued some tough statements.

But actions of real consequence? So far, none. Southeast Asian foreign ministers, meeting last week in Cambodia with Mr. Powell, agreed to send a delegation to Burma no later than October. October? While one of the world's most courageous political leaders languishes in one of its most infamous jails? Where are Kofi Annan and the U.N. Security Council? Where are the executive orders that President Bush could issue today? "If the international community has the political will to stand for freedom in Burma, change can come to that beleaguered country," Mr. McConnell said last week. He's right. Inside Insein Prison, and throughout the larger prison that Burma has become, a lot rides on that "if."

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 2003]

IT'S TIME TO TURN THE TABLES ON BURMA'S THUGS

(By Colin L. Powell)

WASHINGTON.—United Nations Special Envoy Razali Ismail has just visited Burma and was able to bring us news that Aung San Suu Kyi, a Nobel Peace Prize winner and the leader of a peaceful democratic party known as the National League for Democracy, is well and unharmed. The thoughts and prayers of free people everywhere have been with her these past two weeks. Our fears for her current state of health are now somewhat lessened. On May 30, her motorcade was attacked by thugs, and then the thugs who run the Burmese government placed her under "protective custody." We can take comfort in the fact that she is well. Unfortunately, the larger process that Ambassador Razali and Aung San Suu Kyi have been pursuing—to restore democracy in Burma—is failing despite their goodwill and sincere efforts. It is time to reassess our policy toward a military dictatorship that has repeatedly attacked democracy and jailed its heroes.

There is little doubt on the facts. Aung San Suu Kyi's party won an election in 1990 and since then has been denied its place in Burmese politics. Her party has continued to pursue a peaceful path, despite personal hardships and lengthy periods of house arrest or imprisonment for her and her followers. Hundreds of her supporters remain in prison, despite some initial releases and promises by the junta to release more. The party's offices have been closed and their supporters persecuted. Ambassador Razali has pursued every possible opening and worked earnestly to help Burma make a peaceful transition to democracy. Despite initial statements last year, the junta—which shamelessly calls itself the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC)—has now refused his efforts and betrayed its own promises.

At the end of last month, this rejection manifested itself in violence. After the May 30 attack on Aung San Suu Kyi's convoy, we sent U.S. Embassy officers to the scene to gather information. They reported back that the attack was planned in advance. A series of trucks followed her convoy to a remote location, blocked it and then unloaded thugs to swarm with fury over the cars of democracy supporters. The attackers were brutal and organized; the victims were peaceful and defenseless. The explanation by the Burmese military junta of what happened doesn't hold water. The SPDC has not made a credible report of how many people were killed and injured. It was clear to our embassy officers that the members of the junta were responsible for directing and producing this staged riot.

We have called for a full accounting of what happened that day. We have called for Aung San Suu Kyi to be released from confinement of any kind. We have called for the release of the other leaders of the National League for Democracy who were jailed by the SPDC before and after the attack. We have called for the offices of the National League for Democracy to be allowed to reopen. We are in touch with other governments who are concerned about the fate of democracy's leader and the fate of democracy in Burma to encourage them, too, to pressure the SPDC.

The Bush administration agrees with members of Congress, including Sen. Mitch McConnell, who has been a leading advocate of democracy in Burma, that the time has come to turn up the pressure on the SPDC.

Here's what we've done so far. The State Department has already extended our visa restrictions to include all officials of an organization related to the junta—the Union Solidarity and Development Association—and the managers of state-run enterprises so that they and their families can be banned as well.

The United States already uses our voice and our vote against loans to Burma from the World Bank and other international financial institutions. The State Department reports honestly and frankly on crimes of the SPDC in our reports on Human Rights, Trafficking in Persons, Drugs, and International Religious Freedom. In all these areas, the junta gets a failing grade. We also speak out frequently and strongly in favor of the National League for Democracy, and against the SPDC. I will press the case in Cambodia next week when I meet with the leaders of Southeast Asia, despite their traditional reticence to confront a member and neighbor of their association, known as Asean.

Mr. McConnell has introduced the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act in the Senate; Reps. Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos have introduced a similar bill in the House. We support the goals and intent of the bills and are working with the sponsors on an appropriate set of new steps. Those who follow this issue will know that our support for legislation is in fact a change in the position of this administration and previous ones as well. Simply put, the attack on Ms. Suu Kyi's convoy and the utter failure of the junta to accept efforts at peaceful change cannot be the last word on the matter. The junta that oppresses democracy inside Burma must find that its actions will not be allowed to stand.

There are a number of measures that should now be taken, many of them in the proposed legislation. It's time to freeze the financial assets of the SPDC. It's time to ban remittances to Burma so that the SPDC cannot benefit from the foreign exchange. With legislation, we can, and should, place restrictions on travel-related transactions that benefit the SPDC and its supporters. We also should further limit commerce with Burma that enriches the junta's generals. Of course, we would need to ensure consistency with our World Trade Organization and other international obligations. Any legislation will need to be carefully crafted to take into account our WTO obligations and the president's need for waiver authority, but we should act now.

By attacking Aung San Suu Kyi and her supporters, the Burmese junta has finally and definitively rejected the efforts of the outside world to bring Burma back into the international community. Indeed, their refusal of the work of Ambassador Razali and of the rights of Aung San Suu Kyi, and her supporters could not be clearer. Our response must be equally clear if the thugs who now rule Burma are to understand that their fail-

ure to restore democracy will only bring more and more pressures against them and their supporters.

[From the Financial Times, June 25, 2003]

BURMESE MILITARY BRUTALITY CANNOT BE TOLERATED

(By Jack Straw)

Last week was Aung San Suu Kyi's 58th birthday. What should have been a day of quiet celebration with family and friends for the Nobel Peace Prize winner was instead spent in detention in a jail outside Rangoon.

The Burmese regime's claims that she is in "protective custody" after her supporters clashed with opponents on May 30 lacks credibility. We know from witnesses' accounts that thugs, armed and hired by the regime, ambushed Ms Suu Kyi and her supporters in a premeditated attack. Dozens of civilians were killed and injured, scores were arrested, many more are still in hiding. The regime has closed the offices of Ms Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy and detained party leaders and workers across the country.

Ms Suu Kyi herself was taken away by the military authorities. For some time, nobody knew where she was being held, or in what conditions. Last Thursday, the Foreign Office revealed that she was being kept in a two-room hut at the notorious Insein jail just outside Rangoon.

We understand that Ms Suu Kyi is being held under the most draconian legislation that the military authorities have at their disposal—Section 10(a) of the 1975 State Protection Law. This allows for her detention, without access to family or lawyers, for up to five years—with no prospect of appeal.

She has been isolated from her supporters, both inside Burma and beyond. Attempts by others, including Mike O'Brien, a Foreign Office minister, to get in touch with Ms Suu Kyi have been frustrated by the regime. She remains cut off and locked up. This is wholly unacceptable.

Far from Ms Suu Kyi's being in "protective custody", the only people being "protected" by her detention are those in the military regime itself. They hope that by keeping her—and the democratic movement—incarcerated they can cling on to power. The military government, which attempts to run Burma through fear and intimidation, is not only brutal but also corrupt and incompetent. A once prosperous country is being run into the ground. Poverty is rife and diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/Aids are spreading.

In stark contrast to the Burmese military junta, and to their enduring fury, Ms Suu Kyi commands the support and respect of the Burmese people. Ever since her party won an election in 1990, the regime has harassed and intimidated Ms Suu Kyi and her supporters. She has already suffered long spells of house arrest and imprisonment.

Hundreds of her supporters are also in prison, many without trial. Others have been blackmailed or intimidated into giving up politics. But whenever and wherever she travels, ordinary people still turn out in their thousands to see and hear her. For them she is a marker of hope for a better future.

The UK, together with our partners in the European Union, the US and other members of the international community, are pressing the regime to begin a process of national reconciliation and democracy. Burma's neighbors too, especially its fellow members of the Association of South East Asian Nations, have been dismayed by the detention of Ms Suu Kyi and have called publicly for her release.

We welcome this international consensus. Regrettably, the Burmese regime shows a

cynical and blatant disregard for the views of others. It responds only to direct pressure. The EU has therefore decided to increase sanctions against Burma.

We have already applied an arms embargo and a ban on the sale of any items that could be used for torture or repression, on defense links and non-humanitarian aid. High-level contacts are also prohibited. We have already introduced an assets freeze and the EU has suspended Burma's trading privileges. The US has taken similar steps.

We have now agreed to take these measures further. Our ban on Burmese ministers visiting the EU will be extended to include senior managers of state-run enterprises and officials from organizations linked to the government. Further pressure will follow unless the regime moves rapidly to restore civilian rule and democracy.

The hopes and aspirations of the Burmese people cannot be frustrated. The spirit and justness of the democracy movement cannot be contained by violence or prison cells. We call on the friends of Burma, in Asia and around the world, to redouble their efforts to help Ms Suu Kyi and the people of Burma move toward national reconciliation, respect for human rights and the democracy they so richly deserve.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorial of July 14 says:

It's been a month since Secretary of State Colin L. Powell promised prompt action to penalize the generals he referred to as "the thugs who run the Burmese government." The time had come, he said in an op-ed article in the Wall Street Journal, to freeze their financial assets and ban remittances into Burma. But the administration has taken no such steps. It's been six weeks since the junta sent 3,000 vigilantes armed with wooden bats and sharpened iron rods, to beat and stab Aung San Suu Kyi's supporters as they traveled with her in the hinterland. [She] apparently escaped injury but was taken into custody and, except for one brief interview with a U.N. envoy, has not been heard from since.

And the United Nations? You might think the Security Council would have swung into action to demand freedom for one of the world's most courageous leaders and for her colleagues and to address the threat to regional stability posed by the increasingly erratic junta. After all, there is no dispute as to her legitimacy; the party she leads overwhelmingly won an election in 1990 but has never been permitted to take its rightful place in government. So far, however, the chief U.S. response has been the election of Burma—or Myanmar, as the generals call it—to the presidency of the General Assembly for the session that begins in September.

The Washington Post June 22, last year:

But actions of real consequences? So far, none. Southeast Asian foreign ministers, meeting last week in Cambodia with Mr. Powell, agreed to send a delegation to Burma no later than October. October? While one of the world's most courageous political leaders languishes in one of its most infamous jails? Where are Kofi Annan and the U.N. Security Council? Where are the executive orders that President Bush could issue today?

I appreciate very much, and I referred to, Secretary Colin Powell's article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on June 12 and, on June 25, Jack Straw's article—the Foreign Secretary, as we all know, of our close friend and ally, England. He wrote:

Last week was Aung San Suu Kyi's 58th birthday. What should have been a day of

quiet celebration with family and friends for the Nobel Peace Prize winner was instead spent in detention in a jail outside Rangoon.

Far from Ms. Suu Kyi's being in "protective custody," the only people being "protected" by her detention are those in the military regime itself. They hope that by keeping her—and the democratic movement—incarcerated they can cling on to power. The military government, which attempts to run Burma through fear and intimidation, is not only brutal, but also corrupt and incompetent. A once prosperous country is being run into the ground. Poverty is rife and diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS are spreading.

In stark contrast in the Burmese military junta, and to their enduring fury Ms. Suu Kyi commands the support and respect of the Burmese people. Ever since her party won an election in 1990, the regime has harassed and intimidated Ms. Suu Kyi and her supporters. She has already suffered long spells of house arrest and imprisonment.

Hundreds of her supporters are also in prison, many without trial. Others have been blackmailed or intimidated into giving up politics. But whenever and wherever she travels, ordinary people still turn out in the thousands to see and hear her. For them, she is a marker of hope for a better future.

He concludes by saying:

The hopes and aspirations of the Burmese people cannot be frustrated. The spirit and justness of the democracy movement cannot be contained by violence or prison cells. We call on the friends of Burma, in Asia and around the world, to redouble their efforts to help Ms. Suu Kyi and the people of Burma move toward national reconciliation, respect for human rights, and democracy they so richly deserve.

Mr. President, we need the Security Council to debate this issue. Our Ambassador and our Secretary of State should call for that debate. Our administration, following the passage of this legislation, should immediately implement Executive orders that can further put restrictions on our relations with this gang of thugs in Burma.

Finally, there are probably people who may be viewing this action by Congress today and the comments the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McConnell, and I are making and saying: You know, Burma is a small country, far away. It is rise or fall. Its type of government has very little impact on the United States economically, culturally, politically, or militarily.

But I argue that that is not the case, particularly when we look at the flow of drugs and many other things that are happening in this country.

Why is it that these Senators are not talking about Iraq? Americans are dying—one a day—there. There is an unfolding scandal, or mini-scandal, about who knew what and when and why, and there is a great politicization of that. North Korea has threatened to develop nuclear weapons. Iraq apparently is doing that. Why isn't the Senate devoting their attention to larger issues that far more vastly affect the U.S. national security?

The answer is simple: This democracy movement in Burma is what America is all about. Over 200 years ago, in a very small country, a very

small movement for independence—which was given very little chance—took place in this country. If it had not been for the help of other countries—particularly France—the United States may have achieved its independence over time, but certainly not in the way that we did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for the majority debate has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, at the risk of redundancy, what is happening in Burma is what the United States is all about—our defense of freedom and democracy, even if it doesn't affect our national interest. That is what makes America different.

I argue that this administration, this Congress, and the American people will reconfirm their commitment to their freedom, democracy, and to one of the great heroic figures in history, and that is Madam Aung San Suu Kyi, who has the profound respect, appreciation, affection, and admiration of all who have encountered her and many who have not.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Before the Senator leaves, I thank him for his passionate and insightful comments about the situation in Burma. No one has said it better. I also share his view that the U.N. ought to take up this matter. I wish to mention to my friend from Arizona that, in discussion with the special envoy, Mr. Razali, last week, he showed very little enthusiasm. The reason is that China might veto it.

I wonder if the Senator shares my view that I don't care whether China would take such an action, this needs to be discussed before the Security Council, debated among the most important countries in the world. Let the Chinese in public rationalize such an action if they are inclined to do so. I wonder if my friend shares my view on that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, yes, I think if it is China's view that the Security Council should not take up an issue of basic fundamental human rights and democracy and wish to veto it, that is their right as members of the U.N. Security Council. But the fact is, that does not relieve the United States of our obligation to bring it up.

One other aspect. Since we have met with Mr. Razali on a number of occasions, up until our last meeting with the special envoy of the U.N., Mr. Razali, he was generally upbeat that things would get better in Burma, that some of the restrictions on Aung San Suu Kyi would be relaxed, and that we should take this moderate approach. In fact, there was even little criticism of the inclusion of Burma in ASEAN because that would bring them into the fold. Now they are facing the embarrassing prospect of, 2 years from now, Burma taking over the chairmanship of ASEAN itself. That is remarkable.

So it was very interesting to me that Mr. Razali, for all intents and purposes—from my impression of our conversation—has basically given up on the policy of sort of appeasement, bringing along the junta so they would become more democratic, et cetera. In fact, I think his statements, authenticated by events, indicate that that policy has been an abject failure.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct. This policy of engagement has been a total failure. That is part of what our bill is about today. It is to not only establish a leadership role for the United States but to lead the world in moving in a different direction.

The Senator from Kansas is here, and he also had a chance to meet with Mr. Razali and has made an important contribution to this debate. I believe we have enough time to accommodate not only Senator BROWNBACK but Senator LEAHY as well.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President—

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have an inquiry. How much time is available on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 11 minutes 9 seconds remaining.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I will not speak long. The Senator from Kentucky has covered this very well, as well as the Senator from Arizona. I think it is important that the Senate take up this resolution. It is an important time to do this and it is an important cause.

There are two narrow issues I would like to comment on briefly regarding the situation of the neighboring country of Thailand.

Thailand has been a strong ally of the United States for some period of time and has worked closely with us on a number of issues in which we have a strong interest in the region. Yet on this issue of Burma, Thailand has not been constructive. As a matter of fact, it has put forward a number of really quite negative comments.

The current Thai Prime Minister most distressingly has begun an assault on Burmese exiles living as refugees on the Thai-Burma border, which leads me to the next category on which I think we need to be pressing.

I have been to the Thai-Burma border. The exiles, because of the Burmese Government, have fled to the Thai border and are in refugee camps. They are subjected to all sorts of horrific conditions—living conditions that are not appropriate, sanitation conditions that are not appropriate, and then they are being trafficked, as people move through, trying to take young women and children into the sex trade that flourishes in Thailand and other places, but particularly in Thailand.

We have seen a rapid slave trade, trafficking in persons. Sex trafficking is taking place because of the Burmese Government and what they are doing,

and the complicity of the Thai Government of not dealing with this situation on the border, of not condemning those in the Burmese Government who are causing problems.

I rise in support of the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky. What is happening in Burma is an extraordinary situation. It is having huge human consequences in the region with people fleeing from the Burmese Government and who then are being trafficked, and we are not getting the help and support we need from a number of countries, particularly Thailand. This seems to be propping up the Burmese regime. This is something about which we should be very clear to our allies cannot continue.

I rise in strong support of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. I urge its unanimous passage and world condemnation of what is taking place by the Government of Burma.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may briefly say before the Senator from Kansas leaves, I thank him for having a hearing on the Burma situation and for being exceedingly involved and knowledgeable about this issue. I am sure he shares my view that this is going to be a long struggle. We are going to be dealing with this issue, unfortunately, next year when this certification process kicks in and we are back to reviewing the Burmese Government. I hope I am wrong. I hope by this time next year Aung San Suu Kyi is not only out of jail but in power. I would not bet on it.

I thank the Senator from Kansas for his important contributions.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2330, the Burma Sanctions bill.

It is a travesty that today, 55 years after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and only weeks after fighting a war to liberate 24 million Iraqis, we watch the military junta in Rangoon violently and ruthlessly suppress the rights of the Burmese people.

The bill before us, like S. 1182, will send a strong message to the thugs running Burma that the U.S. Congress will not tolerate their abrogation of the rule of law.

The international community needs to follow suit. This is especially true with regard to Burma's neighbors—the countries of the ASEAN group—and the Security Council of the United Nations.

I would like to call attention to a July 14 Washington Post editorial that very clearly states the need for a unified, international approach to confronting the military junta in Burma. The editorial asserts that the United Nations must do more to push Burma toward reform and democratization. And it draws attention to the sorry fact that Burma has been elected to

provide the vice president of the United Nation's General Assembly for the session beginning in September 2003.

It is appalling that one of the world's most oppressive regimes has been chosen by its neighbors for a leadership role at the United Nations. This selection serves only to undermine the credibility of the United Nations and the General Assembly.

I support H.R. 2330 because I am a strong advocate for human rights and democratic governance in Southeast Asia and around the world. I call on my colleagues to pass this bill.

I also call on administration officials to raise the military junta's suppression of human and political rights—including the illegal arrest of opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi and at least 17 officials of her party on May 30 when they meet with their ASEAN nation counterparts.

Finally, I urge the international community to stand up to the Burmese dictatorship. We must remain steadfast in our resolve to restore the freedom of the Burmese people. We need to send a message to these thugs that their brutal reign of oppression and terror does not go unnoticed and will not last.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the House of Representatives for passing the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 and to urge the Senate to take swift action on the House bill to get it to the President's desk.

The 418-to-2 House vote to ban all imports from Burma is an important statement to support for human rights, the rule of law, and democracy in Burma.

Over 6 weeks have passed since Aung San Suu Kyi and several of her National League for Democracy colleagues came under attack by paramilitary thugs and were subsequently detained by the ruling military junta, the State Peace and Development Council, SPDC.

Since then, with the exception of a brief visit by the U.N. Special Envoy to Burma, Razali Ismail, Suu Kyi has been held incommunicado reportedly in the notorious Insein Prison.

The events of May 30 clearly indicate that the military junta has no intention of adhering to its commitment to engage the NLD in a substantive dialogue on political reform and national reconciliation.

Prompt Senate action will put the U.S. Congress firmly on record in support of Suu Kyi's immediate release and the legitimate democratic aspirations of the Burmese people as expressed by the 1990 parliamentary elections, decisively won by the NLD.

The only difference in the House bill as opposed to the Senate bill passed last month—a 3-year sunset on the sanctions—is acceptable, if not ideal.

Now, I call on the international community, in particular ASEAN and the United Nations, to follow Congress's lead and take action to bring pressure to bear on the SPDC.

A united effort is critical for sanctions to be most effective. The regime must know that the world speaks with one voice and its days are numbered.

I urge my colleagues to support the House bill so that the President can sign it into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while both the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Kentucky are on the floor, I want to take a minute to praise them for their outstanding statements. I strongly support the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act that Senator MCCONNELL, Senator FEINSTEIN, and others have introduced and shepherded through the Senate earlier this year.

I have lost count of the number of times my good friend from Kentucky has come to the Chamber to send an important message to the very brutal and very corrupt regime in Burma. Senator MCCONNELL's message has been: Your conduct is outrageous. It should not be allowed to stand. Aung San Suu Kyi is the democratically elected leader of Burma, and she and her fellow opposition leaders must be immediately released.

The Senator from Kentucky and those who join with him are absolutely right. Our country, the greatest democracy history has ever known, must stand for democratic principles around the world. This legislation helps the United States do just that.

Since the McConnell-Feinstein legislation was introduced—and passed by the Senate 93 to 1, something we do not see too often around here—it has helped send a clear signal to the administration, ASEAN members, and the international community that we need to increase the pressure on the illegitimate regime in Burma.

We have seen some good first steps taken by the State Department, including a ban on remittances, expansion of visa restrictions, and a strong statement by Deputy Secretary Armitage on Friday.

But, U.S. action can only go so far. There has to be active pressure from Burma's neighbors in Southeast Asia. I single out Thailand, Japan, and China. These nations have to disavow what we all know has been a failed policy of engagement.

In many cases, engagement can be a good thing. In many cases, engagement can help resolve difficult international issues. This is not one of those times.

Mr. President, I am glad to see some positive developments have occurred on this issue in Asia. The ASEAN nations have taken the unprecedented step of expressing concern with the situation in Burma. The Japanese have suspended some forms of aid to the regime.

But that is not enough. Other leaders in the region have to make unequivocal statements saying what we in the United States Senate are saying: Aung San Suu Kyi is the democratically elected leader of Burma and the military junta has to release her and her followers.

The world needs to do more. The U.N. has to become more involved. The Security Council should be briefed by U.N. Special Envoy Razali Ismail on the situation in Burma and Security Council action should be seriously considered.

My purpose in speaking, obviously, is to support this legislation. However, I wanted to take a moment to praise the deep and personal effort by the Senator from Kentucky on Burma. He has shown courage, but, perhaps more importantly, he has demonstrated tremendous persistence in keeping our attention focused on Burma. Sometimes we forget some of what we say is heard and has an impact in other parts of the world. In some cases, it may not be made it back to our own States, but it is heard in the parts of the world where it makes a big difference. This is one of those times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind comments on the Burma bill and appreciated his forceful advocacy of passage.

In terms of the parliamentary situation, is there time left on the Burma bill on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am prepared to yield back the time that remains on this side if the Senator from Vermont would do the same.

Mr. LEAHY. I will do the same. Should we ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Do we need to ask for the yeas and nays on the Burma bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be appropriate.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2330) was ordered to the third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to vote on passage of the bill at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2658, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dorgan amendment No. 1264, to require from the President a budget amendment for the budget for fiscal year 2004 on the amounts requested for military operations in Iraq in fiscal year 2004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 30 minutes equally divided in relationship to amendment No. 1264 by Senator DORGAN.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time of the quorum call not be charged either to the Republican or Democratic side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is there is a 30-minute timeframe on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me indicate I have just been sitting with my colleagues, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, discussing this amendment. I want to discuss just for a moment why I have offered this amendment and then indicate that I think we have a responsibility here in the Congress to try to understand how much these operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and other areas of the world cost us and how we plan to pay for them.

Before I do that, let me say the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member, two Members for whom I have the highest regard—and I happen to serve on this subcommittee—have distinguished military records. The ranking member has the Medal of Honor. The chairman flew over the hump in China during the Second World War. He has a very distinguished record. I very much appreciate working with them. They have done an extraordinary job with the piece of legislation brought to the floor of the Senate to fund our defense needs.

I visited Afghanistan during the past year or so. I have not visited Iraq. But I happen to think what we have done, with the wonderful men and women who wear America's uniform, is kick the Taliban out of Afghanistan and free the people of Afghanistan. What we have done is to drive underground—at this point—Saddam Hussein and liberate the people of Iraq. It has been done by very brave, courageous, and wonderful young men and women, and with equipment which is funded by this subcommittee.

I know my colleagues likely have done what I have done. They have visited the site where they are producing a little airplane called the Predator. It

is not much bigger than a little Piper Cub. It flies at about the same speed. It is a little airplane without a pilot which sits up there for nearly a day and flies around the battlefield and with a sensor can give you a vision of exactly what is on the battlefield, and you have someone sitting in Florida watching a television monitor seeing what is on the battlefield in Afghanistan or Iraq. It is really breathtaking technology which is being used.

The Predator is low tech. The Global Hawk does the same at multiples of altitude. The Global Hawk is also an unmanned aerial vehicle that has been used extensively in both theaters.

Those are the kinds of new technologies that are really quite remarkable—the technologies that are funded by this subcommittee.

In addition to the technology, weapons, and air assets and ground assets, the soldiers themselves are quite extraordinary. I appointed a young man to the United States Naval Academy, Jason Frye, from Hazen, ND. Jason Frye was recently at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. In fact, Senator INOUE called Jason on Friday. He is a young marine who was in Iraq. He had part of his arm blown off by a rocket-launched grenade. When I went to visit him at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, he was worried about his unit. He wanted to be back with his unit. He wondered how his unit was doing in Iraq. This young man had a battlefield injury. They had to use the cord from the radio in his Humvee to wrap around his arm as a tourniquet to stop the bleeding. He got medical attention at a field hospital in Iraq.

What a remarkable young man. He is a symbol of all the young men and women who answered the call and have done their duty. Our thoughts and prayers are with them. Our hearts go out to those who have been injured and killed, and to their families.

This piece of legislation is extraordinary. It was introduced by two remarkable legislators. I am pleased to be a part of the subcommittee that supports our national defense needs and supports the men and women who serve this country.

The amendment which I have offered says there is kind of an illusion going on with respect to the cost of what we are doing in defense. It is not a deliberate illusion by anyone. It is this:

We are spending about \$3.9 billion a month in Iraq at the moment—almost \$4 billion. We are spending nearly \$1 billion at the moment in Afghanistan. Those are the costs of the ongoing activities in both countries. Both of these activities are very important.

If we are spending about \$5 billion a month—an annualized rate of about \$60 billion—the question is, How will all of that be funded? Some of it is funded in this legislation. The salaries of the soldiers who would be stationed at Fort Sill, or Fort Lewis, or some other post, we would be paying those salaries anyway. Now they are in Iraq. They are being paid in Iraq.